REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action mailed on June 26, 2006, and submit the following remarks. Applicants request that the Examiner consider the following remarks prior to examining the above referenced patent application after RCE. Claims 1- 11 are pending in this application. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-6 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Coleman, U.S. Patent 5,708,825 ("Coleman"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion in the Advisory Action that the arguments presented in Applicant's previous Reply filed on June 5, 2006 are duplicate to the arguments previously presented, **Applicant asserts that the Reply filed on June 5, 2006 contained new arguments that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Advisory Action, nor in the Final Office Action dated April 5, 2006**. The following arguments were presented in the Reply filed on June 5, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's comments on the below arguments.

In the Examiner's Response to Applicant's previously filed assertion that the specification clearly discloses a single translation step, the Examiner states that, "[a]pplicant's are relying on there being no disclosure of a secondary translation process present in the specification to provide support for 'using only a single translation' to distinguish from the prior art applied" (page 3, paragraph 1). Applicant maintains that the specification provides clear support for a single translation and that the single translation is an integral element of the invention. Nevertheless, Applicant amended the specification to more clearly disclose that fields of a record are fully or partially translated requiring only a single translation step.

The present application describes the creation of an interface file which defines (1) the location of the first data file, (2) what data is to be collected from a first data file, (3) how to format the data (e.g., add a delimiter flag to the end of a text string), and (4) where to save the new data file. Thus, one of ordinary skill would definitively conclude from the disclosure that data is read from a first file, is formatted according to instructions in an interface file, and is saved to a second data file. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill would conclude from the disclosure that a single translation occurs between the first data file and the second data file and

that only two formats are revealed, namely a first format (first data file) and a second format (second data file). Paragraph 58 of Applicants disclosure states, "[t]he Interface File Definition is then used by Interface File Builder 210 to translate the file <u>from</u> the format used by financial institution 102 <u>to</u> a format useable by accounting system 106" (emphasis added).

The Examiner further asserts that if the specification "did provide enablement for 'using only a single translation' the following portion of Coleman discloses such limitation" (page 3, paragraph 1). The Examiner cites column 10, lines 25-32 as evidence that Coleman discloses a single translation. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Coleman discloses a data translation process which starts from creating what is termed an "environment," and extends to rendering and storing translated data. The environment is disclosed as being a combination of definitions and rules that are used to translate the data from the first format to a second generic format; and from the second generic format to a third format. According to Coleman, an environment can be created based on the specific data translation needs. For example, if a user needs to move data from a source Microsoft SQL Server database to a destination UNIX data file, the user may interface with the Coleman system to define the source and the destination. On the source side, this may require the user to create a pointer to the database, define which fields in the database need to be converted, and specify the data type for each field. On the destination side, the user may create a pointer to where the data file exists, specify how the data is to be formatted, and define the data type. When the definitions have been created and saved to memory, Coleman refers to the definitions as an intermediate environment. Thus, an intermediate environment designed for a specific purpose need only be created once. Thereafter, the user can load one or more environment into the translation tool to execute a data translation (*see,* column 21, lines 17-23).

To support the assertion that Coleman discloses such a limitation (i.e., a single translation), the Examiner directs Applicant to column 10, lines 30-33 of Coleman that discloses, "[i]t is noted that the <u>creation of intermediate environments</u> is optional depending upon the user's application" (emphasis added). In other words, a user may create a new intermediate environment or select an existing one, but more than a single translation is always required. It is further noted that the Examiner's citation of Coleman falls within a section of the disclosure specifically directed to the creation process of the intermediate environment. Removing the intermediate environment from Coleman would render the data translation system inoperable and literally destroy the functionality of the Coleman system.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims properly set forth that which Applicants regard as their invention and are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject application. Applicants authorize and respectfully request that any fees due be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 25, 2006   By:

Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com

AXP Docket No. TH200312446   7
1864471.1